Misunderstanding Occult Terminology
Part One: Mundanes

Introduction: The ONA In Context

To understand the modern esoteric or Occult philosophy or movement known by the acronyms O.N.A and O9A it is necessary to understand: (i) the difference between primary, secondary, and tertiary sources; [1] (ii) in the matter of the O.N.A/O9A what constitutes a primary source; and (iii) why using primary sources - not secondary nor tertiary sources - is the means to acquire a scholarly, rational, knowledge of a subject, or a person, or a group or of some event historical or otherwise.

There are currently two main ways for the public to perceive the O.N.A/O9A. (a) By the allegations or assumptions made about it, or the opinions expressed about it, by individuals, by government or corporate funded policy groups, by political advocacy groups, and by politicians, published or recorded in printed form such as newspapers, articles, and books, and/or distributed via digital mediums such as the Internet. In scholarly terms these are considered secondary or tertiary sources, even if the allegations, or assumptions are those of an Establishment institution or an academic. (b) By personally accessing, considering and making logical conclusions from O9A primary sources.

The first way has hitherto been the way of the majority of people and depends on the fallacy of appeal to authority, also known as the fallacy of Argumentum ad Verecundiam and/or on the fallacy of Ad Populum. The second way is the personal way of detailed and time-consuming scholarly research.

In addition, there are currently three different views, perceptions, or definitions, of what that particular Occult philosophy or movement is.

1. The current perception by both the general public and in academia is of it being a satanist group or movement which endorses fascism and/or National Socialism. This perception is exemplified by several recently published academic articles. For example, according to Daveed Gartenstein-Ross and Emelie Chace-Donahue, the

> "O9A should be understood as an esoteric Satanist cosmology, practice, and movement influenced by, though not wholly ensconced in, the esoteric fascist tradition." [2]

According to Shanon Shah, Jane Cooper and Suzanne Newcombe, the ONA is

> "a new religious movement (NRM) that blends eclectic occult elements within its worldview, namely Satanism, magical practice, millennialism and an esoteric interpretation of Nazism." [3]

Regarding primary sources, in the case of Daveed Gartenstein-Ross and Emelie Chace-Donahue they write that they "give Long’s texts more weight than those of others because his writings are repeatedly referenced by O9A texts as the foundation of the philosophy."

In the case of Shanon Shah, Jane Cooper and Suzanne Newcombe, what they term 'primary sources' are "online texts" produced by the ONA and groups associated with it" from which sources they selected texts cited in recent media coverage, stating that these selected texts are internal (emic) sources produced by ONA "insiders or spokespersons". However, they (i) do not define who is or what qualifies them to be an insider or spokesperson, and (ii) fail to reference multiple texts by Anton Long which state that, given the anarchic, leaderless, nature of the O9A, there is not and cannot be any official 'spokespersons' or representatives or any 'insiders' who have any authority to say or write what is or is not O9A. [4]

This view of the ONA/O9A describes what it is convenient to term ONA 3.0. That is, which not only utilizes works authored by Anton Long between 1976 and 1992 but also works, or rather the interpretations, authored by others who self-declare as followers of the O9A or who are assumed by others, including academics, to be O9A or representative of the O9A. Thus in terms of sources, ONA 3.0 utilizes secondary sources.

2. The second view, expressed in *The Boundaries Of O9A Philosophy*, [5] defines the O.N.A as "the esoteric philosophy developed by the pseudonymous Anton Long between 1976 and 2012. Thus, to understand the O9A it is considered necessary to study of the writings of Anton Long, 1976-2012, for they are regarded as the primary sources, the only primary sources, of that philosophy. Which writings were published under that name or using the two pseudonyms which he himself has acknowledged, which are (i) 'Stephen Brown', with reference to the two volumes of The Satanic Letters, 1992, and (ii) 'Thorold West', with reference to the manuscript[s] of *Naos: A Practical Guide To Modern Magick*, 1989.

This view describes what it is convenient to term ONA 2.0, that is, based only on works by Anton Long between 1976 and 1992.

3. The third, and most recent, view defines the O.N.A (ONA 1.0) as both the sorcery and the individual way to wisdom (lapis philosophicus) embodied in the spiral-bound 1989 typescripts circulated as *Naos* in which the terms such as 'mundane', 'satanism', and 'national socialism' do not feature. Hence,

> "there is only one source: the stand-alone manual of modern sorcery and a hermetic guide to discovering wisdom that is described in the 1989 collection of texts titled *Naos: A Practical Guide To Modern Magick*. All other sources that have hitherto been assumed by whomsoever are unnecessary, with Naos clearly written without any mystification." [6]

By studying (i) the texts which contain those three definitions of "what is the ONA/O9A", (ii) the literature given in the footnotes of those texts, (iii) by considering what constitutes a primary source, and (iv) by avoiding fallacies of reasoning, [7] the reader can decide for themselves which definition seems most appropriate.

In regard to term 'mundane' the third view (that is ONA 1.0) given above, can be disregarded since the term is not mentioned in that 1989 primary text.

°°°

One Theme: Mundanes

One theme, or rather trope, [8] prevalent in items, pro and con, about the modern occult movement known by the acronym O.N.A is a misunderstanding of the term 'mundane' as exemplified in a 2017 article by academic Della E Campion. [9] In that article, referenced by several other authors in relation to the O.N.A, she states that the use of the term is a form of "status elevation" to demonstrate that members of the ONA are "superior to mundane people" and a means where the O.N.A can "out-dark" other Satanists and thus present itself as the darkest and most genuine expression of modern Satanism.

However, as has been pointed out, Campion

> "uses sociological and psychological theories and ideas to make claims about and assumptions regarding the personal intent of the authors of the culling texts [and] extrapolating from those claims and assumptions, Campion proceeds to make claims and assumptions about the intent of the O9A itself, thus providing a classic example of the fallacy of illicit transference." [10]

In esoteric terms, she uses existing causal abstractions [11] to classify, to portray, and attempt to understand an esoteric movement instead of using O.N.A primary sources. This failure, in the matter of the O.N.A, to find and to use primary sources is endemic and one manifestation of the zeitgeist of our times where there is a lack of scholarly research [12] and a reliance on fallacies such as the appeal to authority and ad populum.

In version 7 of the *Glossary of O9A Terms* [13] the term 'mundane' is described in the following way:

> "Exoterically, mundanes are defined as those who are not of our sinister kind that is, as those who do not live by The Law of the Sinister-Numen (qv). Esoterically, mundane-ness is defined as being under the influence of, or being in thrall to, or being addicted to, and/or believing in, and/or using as a means of understanding, causal abstractions."

The distinction between the exoteric and esoteric meanings of a term or concept is an important aspect of esotericism, an aspect neglected by academics and others:

> "Exoteric refers to the outer (or causal) form, or meaning, or nature, or character, or appearance, of some-thing; while esoteric refers to its Occult/inner /acausal essence or nature.
>
> What is esoteric is that which is generally hidden from mundanes (intentionally or otherwise), or which mundanes cannot perceive or understand. Causal abstractions tend to hide the esoteric nature (character) of things, and/or such abstractions describe or refer to that-which is only causal and mundane and thus devoid of Dark-Empathy.
>
> Thus, a form manufactured by an Adept for some Aeonic purpose - for example, a tactic to aid strategic aims - has an outer appearance and an outer meaning which is usually all that mundanes perceive or understand, even though it has an (inner) esoteric meaning." [14]

Anton Long linked the distinction to the terms Zahr (Dhir) and Batin from Muslim philosophy used to describe the difference between the exoteric (Zahr) or common meaning and understanding and use of a term, and the esoteric (Batin) often aurally transmitted meaning and use of a term. [15]

Defining Mundanes

The following extract from a text by Anton Long dating from 2011, and thus a primary source for ONA 2.0, explains the usage of the term mundane:

> "One of our axioms is that we classify humans as either our kind or as mundanes. Our kind currently, and for some previous Aeons, amount to perhaps five per cent – the creative or the defiant minority who latently or by means of their pathei-mathos have a certain natural intelligence, a certain instinct, a certain type of personality, certain personal qualities.
>
> Another of our axioms is that in general (with many exceptions) mundanes are made, not born, and that therefore perhaps a majority of human beings (though certainly not all) have the potential to cease to be mundanes. Most of course will never realize this potential, for a variety of reasons. A corollary of this axiom is that the children of mundanes have not as yet reached the age when mundanity becomes or could become fixed – their natural pattern of behaviour.
>
> Thus the reason why children in practical terms are exempt from being considered fair game, a resource, and

why we consider certain activities by adults involving children – and certain proclivities, in adults, in respect of children – to be dishonourable and not something our own kind would do. For such things are one mark of mundanity – of those not able to or capable of controlling or changing themselves.

This axiom of potential within others is one reason why, in respect of culling for instance, we always give mundanes a sporting chance – to see if they can react in a non-mundane manner and so provide evidence of their potential to change." [16]

Another primary source for ONA 2.0 is an earlier (2003) text by Anton Long which provides the wider context for the term:

"Honour, according to and as defined by the ONA, is a specific code of personal behaviour and conduct, and the practical means whereby we can live in an evolved way, consistent with the sinister perspective, and aims, of our Sinister, our Satanic, Way. Thus, personal honour is how we can change, and control, ourselves and live a sinister, a satanic, life. Honour not only defines our personal behaviour, and imposes upon us certain duties and obligations, but it also defines us, as individuals that is, it is an essential part of our identity, as individuals who live by the Law of the New Aeon, and it distinguishes us from the mundanes, from all those who are not-of-us, who do not belong to our kind.

Honour is what binds our ONA family; what makes our ONA family, what makes and what marks our new way of living. For us, our honour is more important than our own lives, and it is this willingness to live and if necessary die for and because of our honour that makes us strong, fearsome, and enables us to live life on a higher level than any mundane. For it is through honour through our fearlessness, our scorn of our mortal death that we come to exult in Life itself. Our honour means we are fiercely loyal to our own kind to those who, like us, live by honour and our prepared to die for their honour." [17]

Haereticus Reputandus
2025
v.2.01

°°°

[1] A primary source is defined in the Appendix

[2] *The Order of Nine Angles: Cosmology, Practice & Movement*, 2023, https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2023.2186737

[3] *Occult Beliefs and the Far Right: The Case of the Order of Nine Angles*, 2023, https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2023.2195065

[4] In a letter to Michael Aquino dated 7th September 1990 ev, Anton Long wrote:

"we feel there can be no religious dogma about Satanism or the LHP: no subservience to someone else's ideas or ways of living. Each individual developes their own unique perspective and insight as a consequence of striving to achieve Adeptship - a perspective and insight which derives mainly from practical experience, both magickal and personal. Thus we uphold anarchism." Included in facsimile in https://archive.org/download/satanicletters-1/satanicletters-1.pdf

He also wrote:

"I claim no authority, and my creations, profuse as they are, will in the end be accepted or rejected on the basis of whether they work. Satan forbid they should ever become 'dogma' or a matter of faith. I also expect to see them become transformed, by their own metamorphosis and that due to other individuals: changed, extended and probably ultimately transcended, may be even forgotten. They – like the individual I am at the moment – are only a stage, toward something else." A facsimile of the letter is included in https://archive.org/download/satanicletters-2/satanicletters-2.pdf

This lack of authority is manifest in the O9A principle termed the authority of individual judgment. In a letter to Michael Aquino dated 20th October 1990 ev Anton Long wrote that the O9A way is:

"guiding a few individuals to self-awareness, to Adeptship and beyond, via various practical and magickal techniques. The emphasis is on guide, on self-development, on self-discovery. There is no religious attitude, no acceptance of someone else's authority and no mystique: the methods, as divulged in the recently published book 'Naos', are essentially practical." Satanic Letters of Stephen Brown, Volume I, https://archive.org/download/satanicletters-1/satanicletters-1.pdf

In a letter to a Miss Stockton, dated 19th June 1991 eh, he wrote:

"I have no 'authority' in the real sense - I simply offer advice and guidance based on my own experiences. I am still learning. What I teach is not 'sacred' - hopefully, it will be surpassed, refined, changed, when others discover and experience and attain.

I inherited some esoteric knowledge, and have added to it and that really is what esoteric knowledge is: a slowly accumulating body of knowledge which re-presents both what Is and what is Not. Gradually, this

representation is refined - gets closer to being a genuine representation.

Thus, when I speak or write I speak or write from my own experience - I do not claim some supra-personal authority, to be in contact with some entity (like Satan) who has chosen me, or empowered me or whatever. I am a unique individual, and what I say or write should be judged by its merits - by whether it works, is effective, is a genuine representation of what it is supposed to be.

My creations do not pretend to be other than what they are - my creations. They are not the 'sacred words of the Devil' or whatever. I may sometimes have been inspired by the Prince of Darkness, but the works are mine - and should be judged as mortal rather than the product of some entity. I leave it to others to claim that their works are imbued with a sacred quality (or Infernal power) and so they deserve 'obedience' and all that religious stuff.

The same applies to the traditions I inherited. They are simply traditions, and like most traditions are a mixture. Some contain a little Wisdom; there are bits of insight; bits of real esoteric knowledge. And an awful lot of mystification as well as some fables. Each individual must assess them for themselves - if they are useful, fine. If not - fine." Satanic Letters of Stephen Brown, Volume I, https://archive.org/download/sataniclletters-1/sataniclletters-1.pdf

[5] *The Boundaries Of O9A Philosophy*, 2021, https://archive.org/download/o9a-boundaries-philosophy-v9_202209/o9a-boundaries-philosophy-v9.pdf

[6] *Longusian Occultism: The Primary Source*, 2025, https://archive.org/download/longusian-tradtion-primary-source/longusian-tradtion-primary-source.pdf

A facsimile of the typescripts of Naos, as circulated in 1989, is at https://archive.org/download/naos-physis-magick/Naos-Physis-Magick.pdf

[7] A summary of the most common fallacies is provided in the Appendix.

[8] Trope: a figure of speech (verbal and written) which is far fetched; a motif, a motive or theme, that represents something which is illogical (such as a fallacy of reasoning) or which is unproven or hearsay or propaganda. The fallacies of reasoning include the appeal to authority and ad populum.

qv. John Dryden, Juvenal (1697) "Where the Trope is far fetch'd, and hard, 'tis fit for nothing but to puzzle the Understanding."

[9] *The Culling Texts: Mythology, Authority, and Human Sacrifice in the Order of the Nine Angles*. La Rosa Di Paracelso 2, 2017.

[10] *Another Academic Misinterpretation Of The O9A*, 129 yf (2018), https://archive.org/download/misunderstanding-the-o9a-v5b_202109/misinterpretation-o9a-v5.pdf

[11] Abstractions - denotata - hide the true nature of Reality:

"The esoteric problem with denoting, by means of an ascribed name or a given expression, is essentially two-fold. First, esoteric-empathy inclines us toward a knowing of the numinous essence that such a denoting obscures or hides, and part of which essence is a revealing of ourselves as but one nexion to all other Life, sentient and otherwise. The second problem with denoting is that there exists in various ancestral cultures world-wide (including some Indo-European ones) an older aural tradition of how it is not correct – unwise – to give names to some-things, and of how some 'names' are 'sacred' because their very use is or could be an act of what we would now describe as sorcery/magick and which naming and which use of such names often tends toward disrupting the harmony between individuals, family, community, land, ancestors, 'heaven and earth', that many folk traditions were designed to aid." Anton Long, *Denotatum – The Esoteric Problem With Names*. Included in *Marcheyre Rhinings - Being Some Writings Relating To The Rounwytha*, 123 yfayen (2012).

"Abstractions (aka causal abstractions) are manifestations of the primary (causal) nature of mundanes, and are manufactured by mundanes in their mundane attempt to understand the world, themselves, and the causal Universe. Exoterically, abstractions re-present the mundane simplicity of causal linearality – of causal reductionism, of a simple cause-and-effect, of a limited causal thinking [...]

Understood exoterically, an abstraction is the manufacture, and use of, some idea, ideal, 'image' or category, and thus some generalization, and/or some assignment of an individual or individuals to some group or category. The positing of some 'perfect' or 'ideal' form, category, or thing, is part of abstraction. Abstractions hide the true nature of Reality – which is both causal and acausal, and which true nature can be apprehended and understood by means of The Dark Arts, and thus by following the Occult way from Initiate, to Adept, and beyond." *The Error of Egoism*, 122 yfayen (2011).

[12] qv. the Appendix.

[13] Version 7.05, https://archive.org/download/o9a-glossary-v7/o9a-glossary-v7c.pdf

[14] qv. *Some Notes Concerning Language, Chants, and Acausal Entities*, Anton Long, 122 yfayen (2011).

[15] In the neglected two-part text *Concerning Esoteric and Exoteric Languages*, Anton Long wrote that what

> "has to be considered is that the ONA uses certain words in an esoteric way – with a specialized Occult meaning – so that words such as archetype and nexion and psyche have specific esoteric meanings over and above, or instead of, their accepted common exoteric usage. Thus, and for example, a word such as Satanas may have an esoteric (batin) meaning and an exoteric (dhir) meaning – with the dhir meaning referring to what mundanes understand as Satan (a particular male causal and demonic form), and the batin meaning referring to what ONA initiates understand as an acausal (non-temporal, non-causally defined) entity Satanas who/which can shapeshift and who/which exists (when in the acausal) outside of our limited (causal) categories such as male/female, singular/plurality, and past/present/future.
>
> Hence, the accepted exoteric understanding of, and/or the appearance of some-thing – such as a name or chant – is not necessarily a guide to or an indication of its esoteric meaning, its use, or its efficacy in terms of sorcery." 122 Year of Fayen (2011), https://archive.org/download/esoteric-and-exoteric-languages/esoteric-and-exoteric-languages.pdf

[16] *Mysterium – Beyond The ONA*. 122 Year of Fayen.

[17] *The Code of The New Aeon: Warriors, Freedom and the Sinister Way*. 114 yf.

Appendix
Primary Sources And Some Fallacies Of Reasoning

Fallacy Of Appeal To Authority

The fallacy of appeal to authority, also known as the fallacy of Argumentum ad Verecundiam, is somewhat misunderstood in this age of the Internet. It is not only citing or quoting a person or persons who is/are regarded, by the person citing or quoting or by others, as an authority or 'expert' on a subject but also citing or quoting the opinion given by some institution, or 'policy/advisory group' or similar, on a subject, regardless of whether or not the 'expert' or institution or whatever has their opinion published by some means or some medium regarded as 'mainstream', academic, or 'respectable' or authoritative.

The crux of the fallacy is a reliance by someone or by some others on who or what is regarded in a particular society as an authority on or as having a detailed or 'expert' knowledge of a subject or subjects.

Thus a statement such as the fallacy of appeal to authority "is when the opinion of a non-expert on a topic is used as evidence" is itself fallacious because although it appears to be a decisive statement regarding 'authority' it is logically not so having not only restricted the fallacy to those are not 'experts' but does not define what an 'expert' or a 'false expert' is or are or who or what person or institution, or 'policy/advisory group' or similar has the 'authority' to declare someone an 'expert' or a 'false expert' in a certain subject or subjects, and from whence a person or an institution, or 'policy/advisory group' or similar derives their own authority to make such declarations.

The corollary of the appeal to authority is personal research by scholarly means of a subject using primary sources.

Primary Sources

Primary sources include contemporaneous manuscripts, letters, diaries, memoirs, personal journals, interviews, speeches, and other materials individuals used to describe (i) events in which they were participants or observers, and (ii) ideas or creations - such as a philosophy, music, literature, or art-work - which they were responsible for. Hence in the matter of a philosophy such as that of Heidegger the primary sources are his published writings, authenticated recordings or transcriptions of his speeches/lectures, and authenticated unpublished manuscripts if any. The writings, opinions, and conclusions of others about that philosophy, and other translations of his work, are secondary sources, with compilations of quotations from such secondary sources, a tertiary source.

Scholarly

To be learned, to be a scholar in the traditional sense, is to have a profound knowledge gained by individual study. The criteria of scholarship are: (i) a detailed, meticulous, unbiased original research on and concerning a specific topic or topics or subject or person undertaken over a period of time, usually a year or more in duration and involving primary source material; (ii) an ability to be able to read primary sources in their original language; and (iii) a rational assessment of the knowledge acquired by such research, with such conclusions about the topic, topics, or subject being the logical result of the cumulative scholarly learning so acquired. If the researcher cannot read primary sources in their original language and has to rely on the translations of others then their conclusions are not original and not scholarly just as if they commit logical fallacies - such as the fallacy of Incomplete Evidence - then their conclusions are also not scholarly.

Fallacy Of Ad Populum

This is when a person either 'follows the crowd' and believes or claims that because so many others have claimed or believe something it is probably true, or when they are convinced, usually emotively, by a propagandist or politician or by some populist speaker that something is true or that someone or some many are guilty or culpable.

Fallacy Of Argumentum ad Hominem

Argumentum ad hominem is when the character and/or the motives and/or the identity of the person presenting an argument is/are maligned or called into question often in an attempt to deflect attention away from the topic being discussed or from the opponents failure to answer questions asked of them or provide the evidence they were asked to provide.

Fallacy of Composition

Also known as the Fallacy of Illicit Transference. This is an example of equivocation, and is when a generalization is made from a few specific instances or examples with the generalization then applied to pejoratively describe or malign a group or organization or person.

Fallacy Of The False Cause

Generally referred to by the Latin phrase *non causa pro causa*. This fallacy is the assumption that one thing is the cause of another without any logical reasoning.

Fallacy Of Incomplete Evidence

Also known as the fallacy of suppressed evidence. This is when evidence which disproves or may disprove a claim or conclusion is not considered either deliberately (suppressed evidence) or because of a lack of detailed and scholarly research.

Source:
https://archive.org/download/rational-discourse-internet/Rational_Discourse_Internet.pdf

This item is in the Public Domain